

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant respectfully adds claims 8-11. Claims 8-11 are clearly supported by the Specification on page 7, line 6 to page 11, line 24.

I. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner objected to the Title and the Drawings. In addition, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claim 6 stands rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Finally, the Examiner indicated that claims 2-5 and 7 are objected to for being dependent upon rejected base claims.

II. Preliminary Matters

A. Foreign Priority.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim to foreign priority and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority documents was received.

B. Information Disclosure Statements.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on Form PTO-1449 and Form PTO/SB/08 A & B (modified) submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 27, 2000 and July 21, 2003.

C. Drawings.

The Examiner objects to the Drawings filed on March 27, 2000 because Fig. 2 has Japanese legends, instead of English legends. However, Applicant filed Formal Drawings on

July 20, 2003, which has only English legends listed in the block elements of Fig. 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge the receipt of Formal Drawings filed on July 20, 2003 and to withdraw this objection.

III. Prior Art Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

A. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,96950 to Hsieh et al. (hereinafter "Hsieh"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claim 1 requires:

a communication apparatus having a communication section respectively provided in the digital camera and the image data memory apparatus, and the communication section transmitting and receiving the image data, and a communication path to which the communication section is connected...

The Examiner asserts that claim 1 is directed to an image data processing system and is anticipated by Hsieh. The Examiner asserts that Hsieh's cable 119, buses 122, 124 or 126 are equivalent to a communication apparatus as set forth in claim 1 (see page 3 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Applicant has carefully studied Hsieh's discussion of the cable 119 with buses 122, 124 and 126, which are not similar to a communication apparatus as set forth in claim 1.

Hsieh teaches a moving picture camera 110 that can be connected to a processing system via an external connector outside of the housing of the processing system. Specifically, Hsieh teaches an imaging device inside the camera housing that converts moving pictures to a video signal (Abstract). This camera is connected to a computer system 120 with cache 132 and a main memory 134 (col. 5, lines 60 to 66). In the camera 110, the converted digital signal is compressed using bit reduction circuit 115 and is outputted to a USB Hub 117. The video signal is delivered to the computer 120 via cable 119 (col. 6, lines 35 to 40). Next, the video signal is delivered to the memories; from there, the signal may be processed by using processor 128 (col. 9, lines 21 to 55).

However, in Hsieh, the images from the video camera 110 are compressed and only sent to the computer 120, particularly to its display monitor 138. Hsieh's video camera only sends images to the computer, it is incapable of receiving images and viewing them on the video camera 110. That is, the video camera 110 is equipped to only send the images to the computer but not to receive any image data from the computer 120. In other words, Hsieh teaches a one way stream communication (from the camera to the computer to the monitor) and not visa versa. In short, Hsieh fails to teach or suggest a communication apparatus with two communication sections, wherein each section is capable of transmitting and receiving data.

Therefore, *a communication apparatus having communication section respectively provided in the digital camera and the image data memory apparatus, and the communication section transmitting and receiving the image data*, as set forth in claim 1 is not suggested or taught by Hsieh, which lacks communication section in the video camera capable of receiving

image data. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Hsieh. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection of independent claim 1. Also, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

B. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claim 6 requires:

output means for outputting the desired
image data to be printed from the first
memory sections to an external printing
apparatus...

The Examiner asserts that claim 6 is directed to an image data processing system and is obvious in view of Hsieh. The Examiner acknowledges the fact that Hsieh does not teach or suggest the output means as set forth in claim 6. However, the Examiner asserts that Hsieh's printing port 18 to print image data from card 19 is similar to the output means as set forth in claim 6 (see page 5 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Applicant has carefully studied Hsieh's discussion of printing port 18 to print image data from the card 19, which are not similar to an output means as set forth in claim 6.

Hsieh, in the background of the invention, teaches that a computer only has two ports, a serial port (typically connected to an input device) and a parallel port (typically used for outputting data to a printer). Furthermore, Hsieh teaches that the camera may be connected to

the computer through the parallel port 18 but the printer must be disconnected (col. 1, lines 52 to lines 65). Next, Hsieh mentions that using parallel port for video conferencing is impractical because it takes too long to transfer image data from the camera to the computer (col. 2, lines 10 to 28). As a result, Hsieh teaches using USBs.

However, Hsieh only teaches that the camera is connected to the computer using the printer's parallel port. That is, Hsieh explains prior art with the disadvantage of disconnecting the printer when the video camera is connected. In short, the reference does not teach or suggest printing the images. In addition, the reference does not teach or suggest printing images because Hsieh teaches a video signaling, as opposed to a single photographic picture. That is the image is constantly moving, which would be impractical to print. In short, in Hsieh there is no suggestion to use parallel port for printing in connection with the video conferencing.

Therefore, *output means*, as set forth in claim 6 is not suggested or taught by Hsieh, which lacks output means for printing the image data. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 is patentable over Hsieh. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection of independent claim 6. Also, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 6.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-5 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in the independent form. Applicant submits that since the rejection of the corresponding base claims are believed to be overcome, the objection will likewise be overcome.

V. New Claims

In order to capture the allowable subject matter, claim 8 is added. Claim 8 is similar to claim 2 rewritten in its independent form with all the limitations of the base claim 1. In addition, in order to provide more varied protection, claims 9-11 are added. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 8.

VI. Conclusion and request for telephone interview

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: December 29, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

REG. # 46,075
Kelly G. Hyndman
for Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234